

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-6 are pending. Since no claims are added, amended or canceled, no listing of claims is required under 37 CFR 1.121.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3-6 is noted and appreciated.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Nakajima (US 7,068,314). In response, applicant traverses the rejections.

The present invention is directed to an image data processing apparatus for performing signal processing on input image data. As recited in claim 1, a first processing circuit performs first signal processing with respect to image data to produce a first set of image data. A second processing circuit performs second signal processing with respect to the image data that is independent from the first signal processing to produce a second set of image data. Importantly, the first and second processing circuits process the same image data (claim 1, lines 5-11). Nakajima does not operate in this manner.

Nakajima is directed to an image pickup apparatus having a Y (brightness) process circuit 140 and a C (chromaticness) process circuit. Y process circuit 140 processes a brightness signal of image data and C process circuit 160 processes a color difference signal of image data (FIG. 2 and col. 5, lines 4-49). Preprocessing circuit 130 outputs different signals to each process circuit. Therefore, Y process circuit 140 and C process circuit 160 perform image processing for different input signals (a brightness signal and a color difference signal).

As recited in claim 1, by contrast, first and second processing circuits process the same image data. Image data can thereby be output to a plurality of external apparatuses that require different data processing of the same image data. As a

result, degradation in image data processing is prevented (page 5, lines 6-10 and page 14, lines 8-13).


Since Nakajima fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, it cannot anticipate claim 1 or claim 2 dependent thereon. The rejections under 35 USC 102 of claims 1 and 2 should therefore be withdrawn.

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP.

Date: March 31, 2008

By: 
Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601